

room admissions has jumped to historic levels. Perhaps most troubling is the rise in teen drug use during the Clinton administration. The number of 12 to 17-year-olds using marijuana has doubled. Teenage use of cocaine is up 166 percent.

I think a lot of that has been this ambiguous message, no clear message. What are the costs? The costs are unmeasurable. Loss of loved ones. How many of us know a friend who has died? How many of us know a family who has lost a child? The juvenile suicide rate has skyrocketed. I have two granddaughters, Tara and Nicki. Tara is in seventh grade and Nicki is in fourth. My number one concern as a grandparent is their exposure to drugs in school because they are there. The school administration last year thought I was overevaluating the issue. But last spring at the close of the year, two 6th graders were arrested with drugs. The greatest problem facing this country is out of control use of drugs. Our young people are exposed to it on a daily basis. It is an issue that we must make the number one issue in this country. We must start a war on drugs.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I get the same thing from students in my district. It is the number one issue as well. I now want to turn to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] and yield to him.

Mr. THUNE. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding and crediting him with the great work he has done in introducing a resolution which I think calls attention not only to the problem, helping define the problem, but also in terms of the solutions and where we need to look for solutions. I am proud to be a part of the effort tonight to draw attention to this important issue. If we look at what the future of our country depends upon and where America is headed, I do not think there is any problem that is more pervasive and more terrifying than is drug use in this country. Substance abuse is clearly public health enemy number one.

If we look at the effects, they are seen in our Nation in so many different ways, from crime, to violence, to welfare dependency, to divorce, family breakup, domestic violence, child abuse, high health care costs, the spread of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. The cost to our society according to a recent estimate is some \$400 billion a year.

□ 2000

I have always thought that my State of South Dakota, is somewhat immune from these pressures, but we are seeing an increasing evidence of drug use there as well. In fact, drug-related arrests have risen dramatically. In 1991, there were 1,308 drug related arrests. In 1995, there were 3,000. We are seeing a pervasive problem all over the country. It is something that I want to credit my friend from New Jersey for drawing

attention to, and I hope that we can continue to have a dialog about what we might do as a country, as communities, as families, as churches, to attack this problem and deal with it in a very realistic way.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I hope that this is the beginning of how our House can continue to focus on this most important issue.

THE WAR ON DRUGS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] and I would like to carry on a little bit of this discussion on drug use in America. As I mentioned just previously, we have seen in my state of South Dakota drug use rise in a dramatic way. The number of arrests has almost tripled in the last four years' time.

I want to draw particular attention to one instance that I was recently informed about, which is a good example of this. In July of 1995, drug agents in Lincoln County, South Dakota, got warrants to search a home in the City of Worthing.

Now, Worthing is not what you would call a hot bed of criminal activity. It had a population of 371, but even Worthing, South Dakota, is not immune to the problem of drugs.

When agents entered the home they found what you might expect to find in any home around this country, and that is someone cooking. The only difference was this person was using a recipe from something called the Anarchist Cookbook. He was not cooking with food, he was cooking with chemicals. When agents entered that home in Worthing, a community of 371 people, they found the beginnings of a methamphetamine lab. The man in the home had a wide array of chemicals spread out, and he was trying various combinations, trying to come up with the perfect recipe to cook up a good batch of meth.

Well, eventually he did find the right recipe. I am happy to report, thanks to South Dakota law enforcement agencies, he is now serving a second stint in the South Dakota State Penitentiary. But it goes to show that no city, no matter how large or how small, is immune from the problem of drugs.

That does not mean our communities cannot fight back. There are important initiatives going on all over our State, I believe all over this country, that are attempting to address this important problem in ways that are very practical, very realistic, and I think get at the heart and the core of what the problem is.

If you drive into South Dakota today, you will see when you arrive on the interstate one of 14 different bill-

boards. It says "Warning: If you bring illegal drugs into South Dakota, plan to stay a long, long time." It looks something like this, but you will see it anyplace you enter our state.

These signs are not the result of some piece of Federal legislation, they are not the result of some Federal grant or program. Every billboard is sponsored by a local business. No tax dollars are used. It is an effort coordinated with the state, with local businesses and the cooperation of the private sector, to keep drugs out of our states and out of our communities.

South Dakota is doing other things as well, particularly in the area of our schools. In the largest city in our state, police officers are not only fighting drugs from the police department. They are fighting the war from the hallways of the city's high schools.

Each high school has its own full-time police officer. Each officer has an office at the school. When they walk their beat, they are walking past lockers, past the gymnasium, into the school parking lot, and back through the cafeteria.

The students do not just see the cops when the law is broken. They see officers every day under all kinds of circumstances in the hallways at their schools. These officers are forming bonds with kids, and kids are learning the very fundamental fact that cops are not bad people.

These officers are also able to keep an eye on drug traffic in the schools while keeping an eye on the kids. They talk to students, they talk to parents, they talk to teachers, and they all work together to keep our schools drug free.

People in South Dakota are working at every level to fight the war on drugs. Not long ago a 15 year old came to the attention of the South Dakota Juvenile System. She was running away from home, skipping school, using drugs and drinking.

But instead of just locking her up and then releasing her a few hours later, the State of South Dakota tried a new and novel approach. She was put in a treatment and counseling program. Shortly thereafter, she discovered she was pregnant. Counselors worked with her and with her family to help her quit drinking and taking drugs. She was then placed in a long-term counseling program. She had her baby and went on to live, with the supportive family members, who helped her through the recovery and counseling stages of the process. She went back to school and graduated.

Recently she and her baby showed up at the South Dakota Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse to thank those very people for helping her to get her life back on track.

These people are trying new programs which bring judges, police officers, teachers, parents and problem children together to deal with the problem when it starts. Hopefully this young woman will go on to lead a productive and fulfilling life. The drug

war, I think we all have to keep in mind, is not going to be an easy war to win. But by bringing parents and children and communities together, we can work to keep drugs out of our communities and out of our children's lives.

I might also add that I think it is important and it has been mentioned previously this evening, that we have to somehow get the message through to our children before they make the decision to try and experiment with drugs. To do that, I think we have to let parents be parents and give them more time to spend with their kids.

We are working in a very intensive and conscious and deliberate way in this body as the Republican leadership to allow parents in this country to keep more of what they earn, so they do not spend all their time working three or four jobs, so they have more quality time to spend with their kids.

We tried to provide education tax incentives so that young people today will see hope and an opportunity to go to college, to go on, to continue their education and lead productive lives. Ultimately the best deterrent that we have for drug use in this country is the family. It is the family more than anything else, that helps us shape and define the values of our culture and of the next generation.

I believe, we need to continue to work at that level, in families, in churches, in communities with individuals, law enforcement people, working together, to try and discourage kids from experimenting with drugs in the first place. I look at my two young girls who are seven and ten, and the temptations that are out there today are pervasive, and they are something that is an incredible pressure that I believe all our young people have to deal with in a way we did not when I was growing up.

But even in our state of South Dakota we are seeing an increasing use. It is a problem which is drawing a considerable amount of attention all over this country, and I think that we need to look, again, into the areas that ultimately are going to be responsible for solving this problem, not some big government solution, but people working together in a constructive, practical, real way, that meets the needs of people where they are at.

I appreciate again the opportunity to discuss this issue this evening. It is a very important one to me, being a father, a parent of young children, who are entering that age of their lives when they are going to be faced with these pressures, and I know my good friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON, feels very deeply about this. I would be happy at this point to yield to him.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly, again, a privilege to say a few more things. I ran short of time here a while ago and didn't get to say some of the things I wanted to mention. I think one of the issues we face is that not all Ameri-

cans, and especially in rural America, are willing to admit to the problem. I think everybody knows there is drug usage in our rural schools. I think everybody knows there is some drugs in our small towns. But I don't think they are willing to quite accept the immensity of it, the gravity of it, how much of it is really going on there.

We really have a population across America of people raised in the sixties, and some of those people have never stopped using drugs. So here we have families raising children where drug use has never ceased since the sixties. They have continued to use some form of illegal drugs because they are hooked, and they have not admitted that it is a problem in their lives. But it is.

Last year, I visited a high school close to home, and was concerned about some information I had received about the availability of drugs within the block of the school, about the availability of drugs in the junior high school, and so when I made that visit, I questioned do you bring in dog teams, do you check lockers, do you really make sure that drugs are not kept here?

I was told in Pennsylvania, you cannot do that. It is different State by State. We have had a recent court case in Pennsylvania that has somewhat put the fear in the hearts of administrators and school principals, that they will be sued if they do that.

I am sort of an adventure type. I said I would get sued if it meant keeping drugs out of the school, making sure that every locker, you don't have to really search, you bring in a good dog and you will know if there are drugs in that school, what backpack they are in, what locker or desk they are in. That is just that easy. But that is not common practice in many schools.

I think sometimes school boards are, again, and school administrations, are not willing to admit, I know last year when I questioned sixth and seventh grade having the problem equally to junior high and senior high, I was disputed with that. But then last year, several young people in sixth grade were caught with drugs and were arrested and were prosecuted.

It is clear now. They are afraid of the ACLU. They are afraid of the legal community out there who is going to nail them. I think that is unfortunate. We somehow need to untie our superintendents', our administrators' hands, so they can take whatever means are necessary to make sure that weapons and drugs and stolen property is not being stored on school property.

I think in some cases young people can harbor those things easier in a school where searches are not done and dog teams are not brought in than they can at home, and that is very unfortunate. It is interesting. I was talking to a lady at a restaurant that I stopped at to pick up something on the way to the airport the other day coming in to session this week, and she said to me she

closed her private airport in a little town of 1,000. The reason she closed it was too many small planes were coming in and big cars and she didn't know who they were meeting them. It was a little grass strip in the country, but she allowed people to use it. It was a licensed, legal airport, long enough and in a good location. She closed that airport because she had a sense that drugs were being delivered there.

They came in at the inappropriate times and they quickly sped away after they met the airplane and there were people who have since lobbied her that they sure miss that airport. With the small airports across America, it is very easy to fly a large amount of drugs into our communities very easily.

The other problem that rural communities face, and I am again speaking in a Pennsylvania perspective, more than once as a State Senator I brought the State strike force, the narc units in, and more than once they told the local police they would hang around a while to appease the Senator, but they were going back to the urban-suburban areas where they were really fighting the war on drugs. They didn't want to be in rural America.

I do not personally think in a lot of cases, small rural towns have the same ability. When you look at a small police force of 10 people, you cannot use them as narc agents. You cannot have them investigating in the school and places undercover with young people to find out or in the local pubs where drugs are often sold. You cannot have them, you have to have strangers, you have to have people who know what they are doing. It is a very dangerous business.

So I think another area we need to take a hard look at is, does rural America have the same ability to fight back that urban-suburban America has. I think some people think it is their problem; it is not ours, but I want to tell you, I think drug use is almost as prevalent in rural America today as is in urban-suburban America. That is my own personal view from my own experiences as a parent, as a grandparent, and as a community leader before I was involved in State and Federal Government.

It is an issue that I think we just have to start a war on drugs. We have never fought a war on drugs. We may have had a few skirmishes, a few arguments. We may have spent some resources, but when you look at how much resources, I will go back to something I was talking about earlier.

In the first days of this administration, the President cut the drug czar's office by more than 80 percent and the administration cut DEA by 227 agents. Total funding for drug interdiction in the Caribbean, that includes DOD, Coast Guard, Customs, DEA and the State, dropped by more than 40 percent from '92 to '95. However, the \$1.6 billion the President recently requested for

interdiction is still less than the \$2 billion spent by the previous administration in 1991.

I guess I would like to come back and include in my comments that Congressmen need to speak out, State leaders need to speak out, and this administration needs to speak out. We need to have a crystal clear voice to America that drugs are bad.

I know when I speak to youth groups, I tell them as straight as you can tell them, there is no upside to doing drugs; there is no win to doing drugs. It is a lose-lose-lose proposition.

□ 2015

Until we get that message to our young people, until they understand that that good feeling they have for a few moments, that they are going to end up with a brain that is sub-par, they are going to end up with all kinds of health problems, and the juvenile suicide rate in this country is very much related to drugs and the abuse of drugs and alcohol.

I think we must always remember that the most abused drug in this country is alcohol. All of us have lost friends and loved ones to drugs, hard drugs, but we have lost many friends and associates to alcohol.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would simply add that this is, again, an important subject, one on which I think most of us agree we need to do something, and the current approaches have not worked very effectively.

Frankly, again, it is something where we need to work together. As the gentleman mentioned, I think, when he speaks to young people, one of the best jobs I have in this position is being able to talk to young people around this country about how important it is that they make decisions that are based upon something other than the temptation to use drugs.

I think as we, again, debate this, we have an opportunity. We have to be role models from the top down. People who are in public life, athletes, everybody else, has a responsibility in our culture to try and help define the values that our young people adopt. They are very impressionable at that age.

As I speak with young people in my State of South Dakota, that is something that is very important to me to be able to convey, a message that it is important that we establish a tone, set a tenor, where we discuss values, and where things like drug use are discouraged at a very early age, and we stop it at the point of decision. I think that is something that we have a very intense commitment to. I know the members of our class who have spoken here this evening are certainly interested in that subject.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2107, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. REGULA submitted the following conference report and statement on

the bill (H.R. 2107) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 105-337)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2107) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 7, 13, 28, 30, 35, 40, 54, 61, 91, 95, 106, 131.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 10, 16, 18, 20, 25, 31, 33, 38, 39, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 66, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 79, 85, 86, 92, 94, 100, 107, 112, 113, 116, 117, 119, 120, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 133, 135, 139, 140, 141, 145, 147, 148, 149, 154, 155, 159, 160, and 161; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$583,270,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$583,270,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$120,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$11,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$594,842,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: , and of which not to exceed \$5,190,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended: Provided, That the proviso under this heading in Public Law 104-208 is amended by striking the words "Education and" and inserting in lieu thereof "Conservation", by striking the word "direct" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "full", and by inserting before the period ", to remain available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$45,006,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$4,228,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$62,632,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$11,700,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$1,233,664,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: \$44,259,000, of which \$4,500,000 is for grants to Heritage areas in accordance with section 606 of title VI, division I and titles I-VI and VIII-IX, division II of Public Law 104-333 and is; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$40,812,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: \$4,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$214,901,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted in said amendment, insert: : Provided, That \$500,000 for the Rutherford B. Hayes Home; \$600,000 for the Sotterly Plantation House; \$500,000 for the Darwin Martin House in Buffalo, New York; \$500,000 for the Penn Center, South Carolina; and \$1,000,000 for the Vietnam Veterans Museum in Chicago, Illinois shall be